

Volume 7, Numbers 3/4

ISSN 1083-5423

# TOURISM ANALYSIS

An Interdisciplinary Journal

---

*Editors-in-Chief:*

Muzafer Uysal & Geoffrey I. Crouch

*Regional Editor:*

Klaus Weiermair



Cognizant Communication Corporation

New York • Sydney • Tokyo

[www.cognizantcommunication.com](http://www.cognizantcommunication.com)



# TOURISM ANALYSIS

AN INTERDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL

www.cognizantcommunication.com

## EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

## REGIONAL EDITOR

**Muzaffer Uysal, Professor**  
Department of Hospitality & Tourism Mgmt  
Virginia Tech  
Blacksburg, VA 24061, USA

**Geoffrey I. Crouch, Professor**  
School of Tourism and Hospitality  
La Trobe University  
Melbourne, Victoria 3086, Australia

**Klaus Weiermair, Professor**  
Institute of Tourism and Service Economics  
University of Innsbruck, Leopold-Franzens-Universität  
A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria

### REVIEWS EDITOR

**Keith Hollinshead**  
The Luton Business School  
The University of Luton  
Luton, Bedfordshire LU1 3JU, UK

### ASSISTANT REVIEWS EDITOR

**Marcjanna M. Augustyn**  
School of Sport, Performing Arts and Leisure  
University of Wolverhampton  
Walsall, WS1 3BD, UK

### RESEARCH NOTES EDITOR

**Benedict G. C. Dellaert**  
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration  
Tilburg Univ., PO Box 90153  
5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands

### EDITORIAL BOARD

**Tunay Akoglu**  
Brussels, Belgium

**Francisco S. Alberti**  
Universidad de las Islas Baleares, Spain

**John Ap**  
Hong Kong Poly. Univ., Hong Kong

**Gregory Ashworth**  
Univ. of Groningen, The Netherlands

**Kenneth Backman**  
Clemson University, USA

**Seyhmus Baloglu**  
Univ. of Nevada Las Vegas, USA

**Jay Beaman**  
Auctor Consulting Associates, Ltd.,  
Canada

**Russell Bell**  
Wheeling, WV, USA

**Mark Bonn**  
Florida State Univ., USA

**Graham Brown**  
Southern Cross Univ., Australia

**Chris Cooper**  
Univ. of Queensland, Australia

**Frédéric Dimanche**  
Univ. of New Orleans, USA

**Larry Dwyer**  
Univ. of Western Sydney, Australia

**Thor Flognfeldt Jr.**  
Lillehammer College, Norway

**Sandro Formica**  
Institut de Management Hotelier  
International (IMHI), France

**William Gartner**  
Univ. of Minnesota, USA

**Richard Gitelson**  
Arizona State Univ., USA

**Frank Go**  
Erasmus Univ., The Netherlands

**Jonathan Goodrich**  
Florida Intl. Univ., USA

**Alan Graefe**  
The Pennsylvania State Univ., USA

**Orhan Icoz**  
Dokuz Eylul Univ., Turkey

**Leo Jago**  
Victoria Univ., Australia

**Gayle Jennings**  
Central Queensland Univ., Australia

**Erdner Kaynak**  
The Pennsylvania State Univ., USA

**Ken Kendall**  
Washington State Univ., USA

**Deborah Kerstetter**  
Penn State Univ., USA

**Neil Leiper**  
Southern Cross Univ., Australia

**Marton Lengyel**  
Budapest Univ. of Economic Science,  
Hungary

**Ken McCleary**  
Virginia Tech, USA

**Stephen McCool**  
Univ. of Montana, USA

**Ewen Michael**  
La Trobe Univ., Australia

**Brian Mihalik**  
Virginia Tech, USA

**Allan S. Mills**  
Virginia Commonwealth Univ., USA

**Alastair M. Morrison**  
Purdue Univ., USA

**Gianna Moscardo**  
James Cook Univ. of North Queensland,  
Australia

**Luis Moutinho**  
Univ. of Glasgow, Scotland

**Trevor Mules**  
Univ. of Canberra, Australia

**Suzanne K. Murrmann**  
Virginia Tech, USA

**Francis Noe**  
National Park Service, USA

**Ick-Keun Oh**  
Keimyung Univ., South Korea

**Douglas Pearce**  
Victoria Univ. of Wellington, New  
Zealand

**Musa Pinar**  
Pittsburg State University, USA

**Abraham Pizam**  
Univ. of Central Florida, USA

**Sung-Soo Pyo**  
Kyonggi Univ., South Korea

**J. R. Brent Ritchie**  
Univ. of Calgary, Canada

**Marcus Schmidt**  
Southern Denmark Business School,  
Denmark

**Pauline Sheldon**  
Univ. of Hawaii, USA

**Ercan Sirakaya**  
Texas A&M Univ., USA

**Mark J. Sirgy**  
Virginia Tech, USA

**Haiyan Song**  
Univ. of Surrey, UK

**Harry Timmermans**  
Univ. of Technology Eindhoven,  
The Netherlands

**Rex S. Toh**  
Seattle University, USA

**Sigurd Troye**  
Norges Handelshogskole, Norway

**Timothy J. Tyrrell**  
University of Rhode Island, USA

**Soho Um**  
Kyonggi Univ., South Korea

**Turgut Var**  
Texas A&M Univ., USA

**Betty Weiler**  
Monash University, Australia

**Burhan F. Yavas**  
California State Univ., USA

### EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

**Graham Dann**  
Univ. of Luton, UK

**Daniel Fesenmaier**  
Co-founding Editor  
Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign,  
USA

**Charles Goeldner**  
Univ. of Colorado at Boulder, USA

**Jafar Jafari**  
Univ. of Wisconsin at Stout, USA

**Joseph O'Leary**  
Purdue Univ., USA

**Josef Mazanec**  
Vienna Univ. of Economics and Business  
Administration, Austria

**Richard R. Perdue**  
Univ. of Colorado, USA

**Stephen L. J. Smith**  
Univ. of Waterloo, Canada

*Tourism Analysis* (ISSN 1083-5423) is published by Cognizant Communication Corporation, Robert N. Miranda, Publisher, 3 Hartsdale Road, Elmsford, NY 10523-3701, USA, Phone 914-592-7720, Fax 914-592-8981. E-mail: cogcomm@aol.com, www.cognizantcommunication.com

**Subscriptions:** Published quarterly (subscriptions are sold on a calendar year basis by the volume number designated for that year; prepayment required). US Institutional Rate: Volume 8 \$260.00, Rest of World (ROW) \$290.00. US Professional Rate: Volume 8 \$65.00, ROW \$90.00. Back volumes 1-7 \$200.00 per volume. Payment in US dollars drawn on US banks or by International Money Order. Credit cards also accepted: Master Card/Visa only. Invoices will be issued on receipt of an institutional purchase order. Pay to the order of Cognizant Communication Corp., 3 Hartsdale Road, Elmsford, NY 10523, USA (EIN:22-3188698). **Change of address:** Please supply old as well as new address.

**Advertisement:** *Tourism Analysis* will accept advertisements. Add advertisements are subject to approval by the Editor-in-Chief. For details and rates contact the Publisher.

**Copyright Notice:** It is a condition of publication that manuscripts submitted to this Journal have not been published and will not be simultaneously submitted or published elsewhere. By submitting a manuscript, the authors agree that the copyright for the article is transferred to the publisher, if and when the article is accepted for publication. The copyright covers the exclusive rights to reproduce and distribute the article, including reprints, photographic reproductions, microform, or any other reproductions of similar nature and translations. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without permission in writing from the copyright holder.

**Photocopying information for users in the USA:** The Item Fee Code for this publication indicates that authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by the copyright holder for libraries and other users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) Transactional Reporting Service provided the stated fee for copying beyond that permitted by Section 107 or 108 of the United States Copyright Law is paid. The appropriate remittance of \$20.00 per copy per article is paid directly to the Copyright Clearance Center Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. The copyright owner's consent does not extend to copying for general distribution, for promotion, for creating new works, or for resale. Specific written permission must be obtained from the publisher for such copying. In case of doubt, please contact Cognizant Communication Corporation.

The Item Fee Code for this publication is 1083-5423/03 \$20.00  
Copyright © 2003 Cognizant Communication Corporation Printed in the USA

# TOURISM ANALYSIS

An Interdisciplinary Journal

Volume 7, Numbers 3/4

TOAND7(3/4) 177-292-2003

ISSN 1083-5423

## CONTENTS

### REFEREED ARTICLES

- Identifying Antecedent Factors to the Traveler's Pursuit of a Multidestination Travel Itinerary 177  
*Carmen Tideswell and (the late) Bill Faulkner*
- Disaggregating Visitor Flows: The Example of China 191  
*Min Yan and Geoffrey Wall*
- An Empirical Validation of the Travel Balance Approach as an Alternative to the Tourism Area Life Cycle 207  
*Rex S. Toh, Habibullah Khan, and Irene Siew-Leng Yap*
- Modeling Boater's Choices Among Boating Destinations in Michigan's Great Lakes 217  
*Hee-Chan Lee*
- Measuring Tourist Satisfaction With Multiple Destination Attributes 229  
*Metin Kozak*
- Fear of Falling: An Ethnographic Study of Heritage Tourism in Pineburg, South Carolina 241  
*Rich Harrill*
- Measuring Cruise Passengers' Perceived Value 251  
*James F. Petrick*
- Residents' Attitudes Toward Tourism Development: A Case Study in Kusadasi, Turkey 259  
*Senol Cavus and Abdullah Tanrisevdi*

### RESEARCH NOTES

- A Visitor Satisfaction Study of the Commonwealth Independent States in Antalya, Turkey 271  
*Ibrahim Birkan and Zeliha Eser*
- Student Study Tours: Impact on Tourism 277  
*C. Patrick Fleenor, Rex S. Toh, and David W. Arnesen*

### REVIEWS SECTION 283

### CAPSULE REVIEW: BOOK REVIEWS

- Tourism in Western Europe: A Collection of Case Histories* (Richard Voase, editor) 285  
*Gregory Ashworth*



1083-5423(20030130)07:3/4:02;1-5

(continued on inside back cover)



## RESIDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD TOURISM DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY IN KUSADASI, TURKEY

SENOL CAVUS and ABDULLAH TANRISEVDI

Adnan Menderes University, School of Tourism Administration & Hotel Management,  
Candan Tarhan Bulvari, No: 6, 09400 Kusadasi, Aydin, Turkey

---

Mass tourism may influence local peoples' daily routines. These influences may be seen mostly in the peak tourism seasons. Such influences are formed as congestion, density, overcrowding, and energy shortages. Residents' participation in the tourism development process helps to improve local economies. The purpose of this study was to examine the residents' attitudes toward tourism development in Kusadasi (Turkey) that highly influence mass tourism. Factor, frequency, and chi-square analysis were used in the study. Seven factors were found, which were: negative attitudes toward tourism development, economic benefits, general concerns, congestion, negative economic benefits, cultural concerns, and support to tourism establishments. In addition, the residents' threshold level based on Doxey's Irridex model was explored. The relationships between variables were also measured. Significant differentiations were within age and length of residence.

---

Resident attitudes	Threshold level	Tourism development	Irridex model
--------------------	-----------------	---------------------	---------------

---

The tourism industry changes host populations' social and cultural structure. It also adds value to environmental and historical sources as well as being an economic issue. Only a few had studied the industry's other functions up to the 1980s. In the 1960s the focus was on economic benefits (Ap & Crompton, 1998; Lankford & Howard, 1994) and mainly tourist spending at destinations was analyzed (Pizam & Pokela, 1978). In the 1970s studies on tourism reflected on negative issues, but in the 1980s and 1990s tourism was viewed as having both positive and negative consequences, achieving a balanced

and systematic approach (Ap & Crompton, 1998; Lankford & Howard, 1994).

In spite of the overall economic benefits of the tourism industry, mass tourism can cause adverse effects on the host populations, such as overcrowding, environmental degradation, noise, property destruction, and decreasing tourist satisfaction (Butler, 1996; Lankford & Howard, 1994). The impacts of tourism on destinations and host communities, and associated residents' perceptions and attitudes toward tourism, continue to be an important issue (Lindberg, Dellaert, & Rassing, 1999; Snaith &

Address correspondence to Abdullah Tanrisevdi, Ph.D., Adnan Menderes University, School of Tourism Administration & Hotel Management, Candan Tarhan Bulvari, No: 6, 09400 Kusadasi, Aydin, Turkey. E-mail: atanrisevdi@adu.edu.tr or scavus@adu.edu.tr



Haley, 1999). Thus, the impacts of tourism development (social, cultural, physical, and environmental), besides economic benefits, have been studied in numerous tourism books (Coltman, 1989; Gee, Choy, & Makens, 1984; Holloway, 1989; Hudman & Hawkins, 1989; Mathieson & Wall, 1982; McIntosh & Goeldner, 1986; Mill & Morrison, 1985; Murphy, 1985; Pearce, 1989; Urry, 1990), and have been examined by many researchers theoretically and empirically (Akis, Peristianis, & Warner, 1996; Allen, Hafer, Long, & Perdue, 1993; Ap & Crompton, 1998; Brougham & Butler, 1981; Cohen, 1978; Dogan, 1989; Getz, 1994; Jurowski, 1998; King, Pizam, & Milman, 1993; Liu, Sheldon, & Var, 1987; Martin, McGuire, & Allen, 1998; Pizam, Milman, & King, 1994; Pizam & Pokela, 1978; Thomason, Crompton, & Kamp, 1979). Various models also have been proposed (Allen et al., 1993; Ap, 1992; Ap & Crompton, 1998; Brougham & Butler, 1981; Butler, 1980; Doxey, 1975; Lankford & Howard, 1994).

Outcomes of several studies show that impacts of the tourism industry on host populations are multifaceted. So there is a need to analyze the consequences of tourism development in a given destination. In order to get more reliable findings, longitudinal studies are available in this respect (Getz, 1994; Johnson, Snepenger, & Akis, 1994; Lindberg & Johnson, 1997; Snaith & Haley, 1999; Soutar & McLeod, 1993; Young, Thyne, & Lawson, 1999). While tourism can improve residents' quality of life (Ap & Crompton, 1998), successful tourism development is dependent on host communities' support (Jurowski, Uysal, & Williams, 1997). To drive local economies based on the tourism industry, it must be considered that local people have an involvement in the development process (Allen, Long, Perdue, & Kieselbach, 1988). Researchers emphasize the importance of residents' feelings and suggest that residents could personally influence the decision-making process within their community (Getz, 1994; Murphy, 1985; Snaith & Haley, 1999). Observing residents' expectations toward tourism development is essential in tourism planning. Having residents play an active role in the process and developing positive attitudes toward tourism are very important for long-term stabilization of tourism, especially in those areas where environmental problems occur.

### Literature Review

Several models have been proposed related to impacts of tourism and have helped to evaluate residents' attitudes. Researchers have attempted to determine the variables that influence perceptions of the impacts of tourism and attitudes toward tourism, and also the factors that emerge between individuals and groups who have different sociodemographic, socioeconomic, and sociocultural characteristics.

One of the first proposed models concerning residents' attitudes was Doxey's Irridex model (1975). The model describes that residents' attitudes toward tourism change in four stages: enthusiasm, apathy, annoyance, and antagonism. This model asserts that while initially residents' attitudes toward tourism are enthusiastic, when costs outweigh the expectations or benefits attitudes turn toward apathy and annoyance and antagonism. Similarly, Nemety (1990) also states that residents' attitudes will go through the following stages: welcome, development, resentment, confrontation, and destruction (Johnson et al., 1994). Long, Perdue, and Allen (1990) support these models. These authors conclude that residents' attitudes start favorably and later reach a threshold, after which support for tourism declines.

However, Getz (1994) asserts that the Irridex model should not be interpreted as being deterministic. He bases his opinions on Rothman's (1978) study, which was undertaken in two different destinations. Rothman states that communities that have long-term experience with tourism are able to develop mechanisms to accommodate inconveniences, suggesting that residents' attitudes might also change as time goes by. In spite of the fact that problems related to tourism increased in the peak tourism season, host populations did not perceive these problems unfavorably; they adjusted themselves to changing conditions easily. This finding was based on the reality of experience with tourism, which helped the ability to cope with problems generated by tourism, because residents had been involved in the tourism industry for a long time. Another study by Brown and Giles (1994) sought to determine behavioral adaptations of residents' everyday behavior during the peak tourism season in Byron Bay, Australia. The impact of tourism forced changes to shopping behavior, leisure activities, and in terms of an ability to move. Residents developed three



coping strategies: reorganization, retreat, and reaffirmation.

Another developed model, which is known as "Tourist Area Life Cycle," was proposed by Butler (1980). According to this model, there is a relationship between level of tourism development and residents' attitudes toward tourism, and host populations hold positive and negative attitudes along with active and passive support or opposition. While residents' attitudes toward tourism may be positive in the first stages of a destination's life cycle, they may turn negative because of increasing tourist numbers and existing observable negative impacts. This assumption was supported a study by Martin and Uysal (1990). The authors demonstrated that there was an inverse relationship between level of tourism development and residents' attitudes toward tourism. According to Martin and Uysal, this relationship shows that residents welcome tourism in the initial development process, but as social and physical impacts of tourism begin to come into existence and undesired changes occur, attitudes toward tourism may turn negative. Another supportive study for Butler's model was by Dogan (1989). He postulated that residents' attitudinal and behavioral responses to tourism could include resistance, retreat, boundary maintenance, revitalization, and adoption.

Ap (1992) developed a model to understand residents' attitudes toward tourism by applying social exchange theory to the tourism field. This model is well known among scholars. He was inspired by social exchange theory, which asserts individuals or groups evaluate the expected benefits, the possibility of benefits from exchange, and if the perceived costs are less than perceived benefits, they will be involved in the exchange process. Theoretically, if residents perceive the consequences of tourism as valuable and believe that costs would not exceed benefits, they will support tourism (Jurowski et al., 1997). Applying social exchange theory to tourism, Ap (1992) criticized the previous study's theoretical framework and formulated several propositions, which can be used as hypotheses. According to Ap, individuals and groups in an interaction situation determine their positions toward tourism by taking into consideration cost and benefit balance. While costs occur, if residents perceive services are satisfactory and costs and benefits are balanced, residents' attitudes toward tourism will be positive.

Jurowski et al. (1997) developed another model inspiring social exchange theory and understanding residents' attitudes. The authors proposed a "Path Analytic Model" based on social exchange theory. They explain seven factors that exist in relationship to each other. According to the model, support for tourism is a function of perceived economic, social, and environmental impacts, then economic benefit, use of resources, social involvement, and ecocentric attitudes. They assert that components of the potential economic benefits, use of tourism resources, ecocentric attitudes, and social involvement influence perceptions of economic, social, and environmental consequences of tourism; hence, support toward tourism forms directly or indirectly.

Scholars have tested many independent variables to evaluate residents' attitudes toward tourism development. The work by Lankford and Howard (1994) reviewed independent variables, which have been used in the literature. These can be classified as: length of residence, economic dependency on tourism, distance of tourism center from the respondents' home, residents' involvement in tourism decision making, birthplace, level of knowledge about tourism and the region's economy, level of contact with tourists, demographic characteristics, perceived impacts on local outdoor recreation opportunities, and rate of community growth.

An early study of residents in Cape Cod, Massachusetts, by Pizam (1978) found that there was a significant relationship between an individual's attitudes toward tourism/tourists and level of economic dependency on tourism; furthermore, socioeconomic variables have less impact on attitudes. The findings showed that local people who are economically dependent on tourism have a more favorable attitude in comparison with those whose livelihood does not depend on tourism. Other researchers (Liu et al., 1987; Martin et al., 1998; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Murphy, 1985; Thomason et al., 1979) also tested the issue of relationships between residents' attitudes toward tourism and economic dependency and concluded similar findings.

Researchers who investigated whether a relationship exists between length of residence and residents' attitudes toward tourism (Brougham & Butler, 1981; Liu & Var, 1986; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Um & Crompton, 1987) found that the longer residents stay the more negative attitudes occur as time goes by.



However, Allen et al. (1993) assert that there is no significant relationship between length of residence and attitudes.

Several researchers state that distance of residence in relationship to a city's central tourist area differentiates attitudes. Residents who live farther away from tourist areas (hotel, bar, disco, etc.) are less concerned with tourism impacts, while those who live closer to tourist areas are more concerned. Ryan and Montgomery (1994) concluded the age of a resident was not a determinant of attitude, and hence attitudes shown by longer stay residents were not being influenced by the fact that they were simply older people. Birthplace could be an effective determinant of attitudes (Brougham & Butler, 1981; Um & Crompton, 1987). Brougham and Butler assert that level of contact with tourists influences residents' attitudes toward the tourism industry and tourists.

A cross-cultural study that was undertaken in Hawaii, Northern Wales, and Istanbul by Liu et al. (1987), which compared residents' attitudes in terms of level of tourism development and importance of tourism to the local economy. Their findings indicated that residents are more concerned with positive and negative environmental impacts of tourism where the tourism industry is more developed and the local economy is more dependent upon tourism.

Allen et al. (1993) also compared communities' attitude toward tourism in a study undertaken in 10 different rural areas of Colorado that have different levels of tourism and economic development. The authors grouped the communities into levels of high to low economic and tourism development and tried to determine whether communities' attitudes toward tourism were differentiated by level of development. A study by Johnson, Snepenger & Akis (1994) supported these findings.

Martin (1999) investigated the attitudes toward tourism development of four different groups of residents—business leaders, government leaders, general residents, and retirees—in Hilton Head, South Carolina. He found that even if all groups of residents agreed, there were both positive and negative impacts of tourism development in Hilton Head, and although they were generally supportive of the tourism industry, the attitudes of groups were statistically differentiated.

Another study by Jurowski (1998) was conducted in five rural counties of south Virginia located near

the Mount Rogers Recreation Area. This study examined residents' sentiments about their community in relation to their perceptions of the impacts of tourism and their support or opposition to the tourism industry. She found two clusters; one cluster was more willing to invest personal resources into making the community better, whereas other had stronger feelings about the area in which they lived. She concluded that the group with the stronger feelings for their community was more supportive of tourism development and more optimistic about impacts of tourism on the quality of life in their community. These findings support "growth machine theory," which contends "residents will generally exhibit positive attitudes toward tourism development because they have been convinced by the growth machine that the economic viability of their community depends on increased growth" (Martin, 1999, p. 50).

Martin et al. (1998) examined the attitudes of retirees in a resort community (Hilton Head) toward impacts of tourism and any future growth that can be expected as a result of tourism development. They found that the residents of Hilton Head who are retirees agree that tourism has had a negative impact on the community and they were fairly neutral about their support for tourism's role in the community.

Another cross-cultural study by Pizam et al. (1994) compared attitudes toward tourism in two different communities: central Florida, US (a developed country) and Nadi, Fiji (a developing country). They found similar attitudes toward tourism in both communities, which reflected different physical, cultural, and economic characteristics but were both economically dependent on the tourism industry. Respondents perceived the environmental impacts of tourism and law enforcement agencies as negative, while both perceived impacts of tourism on community as positive according to their economic perceptions.

Akis et al. (1996) compared perceptions of two different communities toward economic, social, and environmental impacts of tourism in Cyprus, where Turks live in Kyneria and Greeks live in Paralimni and Ayia Napa. The authors found significant differences related to social and environmental issues, whereas both groups perceived economic issues as positive, and determined that these differences could stem from the level of tourism development. They further stated that this result supports the assump-



tion that as tourism develops in a given area, negative interactions between tourists and residents will increase.

An early work by Murphy (1985) concluded residents' attitudes toward tourism were more negative than attitudes of business leaders and local administrators. However, Perdue, Long, and Allen (1990) found that both positive and negative perceptions of tourism were not related to sociodemographic characteristics of residents. These authors also stated that variables related to one's livelihood could account for residents who have more positive support for tourism. Contrary to these findings, Husbands (1989) asserts that perceptions are significantly differentiated according to one's social status and class. In addition, a study by Snaith and Haley (1999) investigated residents' opinions of impact of tourism in the historic city of York, England. They found that the resident population should not be viewed as homogenous in its support for tourism development. Opinions of residents regarding tourism and its management were found to be significantly diverse across a variety of socioeconomic and demographic indicators.

Finally, Turco (1998) investigated residents' perceptions toward costs and benefits of an international tourist event—Balloon Festival—that takes place in Albuquerque, New Mexico. He concluded residents who believed the social benefits outweighed the social costs were financially supportive of this event.

After reviewing the literature, it was desirable to examine the situation in Kusadasi, Turkey, a resort community that is heavily influenced by the tourism industry. As Ap (1992) stated, in developing and attracting tourism to a community the goal is to achieve outcomes that obtain the best balance of benefits and costs for both residents and tourism actors. Further, analyzing impacts of tourism can help planners, decision makers, and government members to overcome the negative consequences of tourism in a given destination. In this respect, the purpose of this study was to examine the residents' attitudes toward the tourism development process in Kusadasi.

#### Kusadasi

The history of Kusadasi goes back to the first sea merchants. In the old ages Kusadasi was known as

Scalanova. The region is full of traces of ancient civilizations, such as Ephesus, Miletos, Didyma, and Aphrodisias. There is a house 7 miles south of Ephesus in which the Virgin Mary is believed to have lived, so there is attraction for Christian believers.

Tourism in Kusadasi began with cruise tours. The first tours took place some 33 years ago. In 1967 a French Company built a holiday camp in Kusadasi, which was the spark for the booming industry. In 1974 the population reached 7500; maximum capacity was achieved in 1985. Currently Kusadasi's accommodation capacity is 35,000 beds. There are approximately 150 travel agencies and, besides these agencies, nearly 750 companies directly or indirectly involved in the tourism business. Although the current population of the town is about 35,000, it reaches approximately 500,000 in the peak tourism season, which is May to September.

Development of the tourism industry has eliminated some of the natural beauty of the region. This is a distinctive dilemma for Turkish tourism. On the one hand, tourists need accommodations; on the other hand, when one sees more houses and hotels than natural scenery one does not come back to the same place next season. In this respect, for the 2001 tourism season, major tour operators decided to sacrifice Kusadasi because of various problems, such as overconstruction, underdeveloped sewage system, water pollution, etc.

#### Method

##### *The Survey Instrument*

The survey was accomplished using a questionnaire consisting of three parts, excluding sociodemographic variables, length of residence, and economic dependency on tourism.

The first part asked respondents to rate the perceived current situation of the tourism industry in Kusadasi, on a rule: 0 to +25, +25 to +75, +75 to +100, +100 to -60, -60 to -20. In the second part, attitudinal items were applied. Items used in the questionnaire were based on questions used in previous surveys, particularly those carried out by Ap (1992), Madrigal (1993), Lankford and Howard (1994), Ryan and Montgomery (1994), Getz (1994), Jurovski (1998), Ap and Crompton (1998), Martin et al. (1998), and Martin (1999). Fifty-two items



were chosen from these surveys. Then a pilot test was conducted to check these items based on recommendations of respondents. Within the 52 items, it was indicated that 21 were confusing and 7 had similar meaning. In view of the recommendations, 28 items were deleted. The final questionnaire contained 24 items. These items covered social impacts of tourism such as density, congestion, litter, pollution, and contact with tourists, environment, promotion of the area, quality of life, development through tourism, shopping and recreation facilities, and economic aspects in terms of direct income and employment. Items were been ranked by the degree of agreement with the statements and were posed both in the positive and negative voice. All answers in this part were measured on a 6-point Likert-type scale, with a value of 1 as total disagreement and a value of 6 as total agreement with the item. In the third part, two questions that each consisted of four statements (questions 13 and 14) were designed to determine the respondents' threshold level toward tourism development and sentiments about their own city.

#### *Sample*

The population of Kusadasi was about 35,000. The city was broken into three main districts. Each district was made up of different neighborhoods, which were believed to be associated with changes in social status. Selected districts contained about 15,000 residents. A representative sample of 600 households was selected by the Kusadasi Bureau of Statistics achieving through a spatial sampling frame from each district. In each district households were contacted by face-to-face interviewing and by asking residents to complete a questionnaire, between July 1998 and September 1999. Eighty questionnaires were distributed in 1998 and an additional 120 were distributed in 1999. Of the two hundred questionnaires, there was a response rate of 33%.

#### *Data Analysis*

The analysis of the data consisted of two steps. First, principal components factor analysis with Varimax rotation was used to examine underlying dimensions of the items. An underlying dimension can be used to explain the variation among a set of interrelated, not directly observable, variables. It can

be expressed as a linear combination of the observed variables. The criteria of an eigenvalue exceeding 1.0 and the items loading 0.40 or higher were used. The items were subject to computation of Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which is a measure of reliability of the scale. In addition, other variables were measured through frequency and chi-square analysis (significance at  $p < 0.05$ ).

#### *Results*

Nearly 68% of the respondents were relatively young, below the age of 35. Twenty-five percent were within the 36–50 age group, and the remaining were older residents (7.5%). There were 61% male and 39% female respondents. Forty-nine percent of the respondents were married. The distribution of years of residence in Kusadasi was: 1–6 years (42.5%), 7–15 years 21.5%), and 16 or more years (33.5%). Seventy-two percent of the respondents were college and higher educated, including undergraduate (36%) and graduate (1%), which was thought to be an important aspect for obtaining more reliable data from respondents. Occupation of respondents varied, ranging from officer to student. Of the total sample, 58.5% of the respondents reported their livelihood was not related to tourism while the remaining were employer (17.5%) and employee (24%) in the tourism industry.

A large portion of the respondents (63%) indicated negative development stages (+100 to –60) of the tourism industry in Kusadasi. Residents perceived that tourism development in Kusadasi was likely to have a negative result. Furthermore, they were not satisfied with the planning efforts for Kusadasi and its environment (66%).

Mean scores and SDs of tourism attitude statements are shown in Table 1. The highest mean score (5.24) was related to an economic aspect (Tourism has a major role for local economy). The lowest mean score (1.52) was also related to an economic aspect (We are negatively impacted because of increasing prices in peak tourism season). Positive aspects related to tourism industry are indicated by higher means scores, whereas lower mean scores explain various negative consequences of the tourism industry.

Principal components factor analysis with Varimax rotation results are shown in Table 2. Seven



Table 1  
Mean Scores and SDs of Tourism Attitudes Statements

Item	Mean	SD
Tourism has a major role for local economy	5.24204	0.97007
Tourism encourages social and cultural activities in Kusadasi	4.92357	1.24829
Incomes of residents have increased because of tourism	4.90446	1.04871
It is needed to encourage more quality and boutique tourism establishments to attract more tourists	4.68790	1.42259
Residents will not enjoy the case of attracting more tourists to Kusadasi	4.64968	1.42715
If it was not for the tourism industry in Kusadasi, infrastructure and other facilities would not be improved	4.54140	1.39362
Tourism development provides more employment opportunities for Kusadasi residents	4.48408	1.11864
I believe that the tourism industry has improved the quality of life and increased shopping facilities in Kusadasi	4.34395	1.38542
Economic benefits of tourism outweigh negative consequences	3.96815	1.33695
I think that tourism has improved my culture, knowledge, and manner	3.92994	1.52801
Cultural benefits of tourism outweigh negative social impacts	3.64331	1.42780
Tourists have positively impacted our culture	3.64331	1.42331
Prices of property have increased because of tourism and it is an additional benefit for us	3.47134	1.78871
It is needed to encourage more tourism establishments to attract more tourists	3.14013	1.71889
Tourism establishments should pay more tax than others	2.94904	1.65559
Ordinary residents cannot benefit from the tourism industry	2.87261	1.42652
I suffer from overcrowding and congestion	2.64968	1.60874
I observe that tourism has led to increased crime and vandalism in Kusadasi	2.26115	1.28675
Some health problems such as AIDS have increased in the peak tourism season	2.21019	1.36359
Kusadasi residents have become more ambitious about money owing to the tourism industry	1.94904	1.98002
Kusadasi has become a target destination for terrorists and gangs	1.82166	1.14636
We are unjustly subjected to an energy shortage in the peak season owing to tourism	1.73885	1.12743
The tourism industry in Kusadasi has negatively impacted the environment and led to increased overconstruction	1.64331	1.09786
We are negatively impacted because of increasing prices in the peak tourism season	1.52229	1.02273

Scores ranged from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree.

factors accounted for 85.7% of the total variance. Coefficient alphas for items loading on each factor were 0.79, 0.67, 0.62, 0.32, 0.42, 0.42, and 0.47, respectively. The seven-factor solution was derived from the 24 items.

Factor 1 was labeled as "Negative attitudes toward tourism development." It comprised seven items (0.79 alpha) and explained 31.1% of the variance. This factor contained the items that were related to negative consequences of tourism development in Kusadasi, such as negatively impacting the environment, increasing prices, health problems, energy shortages, crime rates, and finally illegal groups resulting from the tourism industry, particularly in peak tourism season. Factor 2 was labeled "Economic benefits." It explained 26.5% of the variance and had an alpha coefficient of 0.67. This factor included the items related to personal economic benefits from the tourism industry: employment opportunities, general economic benefits, shopping facilities, incomes, prices of property, and quality of life. Factor 3, labeled "General concerns," explained 13.3% of the total variance (0.626 alpha). It

contained items related to infrastructure, trade, and social and cultural activities. Factor 4, "Congestion," explained 5.2% of the variance and 0.32 alpha coefficient. Overcrowding was biggest concern in this factor. Factor 5, "Negative economic benefits," explained 4.9% of the variance (0.423 alpha). This factor included two items and those related to reflection toward tourism. Factor 6 was labeled "Cultural concerns." This factor comprised only two items and explained 2.9% of the variance, with a reliability coefficient of 0.42. Finally, Factor 7 was labeled "Support for tourism establishments." It explained 1.8% of the variance and had an alpha of 0.47. Two items were included as supportive for enterprises both in qualitative and quantitative aspects.

As stated above, question 13 was designed to measure the threshold level of respondents toward tourism development in Kusadasi based on Doxey's Irridex model, ranging as: enthusiasm, apathy, annoyance, and antagonism. More than half of the respondents (54%) indicated that they were in the annoyance stage (Problems related to tourism industry in Kusadasi annoy me and it is high time to do some-



Table 2

Results of Principal Components Factor Analysis With Varimax Rotation (Significant Factor Loadings Only)

Factors	Loading	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained	Rel. Alpha
<b>Negative attitudes toward tourism development</b>		9.153	31.1%	0.790
The tourism industry in Kusadasi has negatively impacted the environment and led to increase overconstruction	0.76598			
We are negatively impacted because of increasing prices in the peak tourism season	0.72371			
Some health problems such as AIDS have increased in the peak tourism season	0.56227			
We are unjustly subjected to energy shortage in peak season owing to tourism	0.82829			
I observe that tourism has led to increased crime and vandalism in Kusadasi	0.62691			
Kusadasi residents have become more ambitious about money owing to the tourism industry	0.40673			
Kusadasi has become a target destination for terrorists and gangs	0.60734			
<b>Economic benefits</b>		7.951	26.5%	0.676
Tourism development provides more employment opportunities for Kusadasi residents	0.53368			
I think that tourism has improved my culture, knowledge, and manner	0.62667			
Prices of property have increased because of tourism and it is an additional benefit for us	0.48616			
Economic benefits of tourism outweigh negative consequences	0.43232			
I believe that the tourism industry has improved the quality of life and increased shopping facilities in Kusadasi	0.70926			
Incomes of residents have increased because of tourism	0.64715			
<b>General concerns</b>		3.756	13.3%	0.621
If it was not for the tourism industry in Kusadasi, infrastructure and other facilities would not be improved	0.73014			
Tourism has a major role for local economy	0.63398			
Tourism encourages social and cultural activities in Kusadasi	0.71408			
<b>Congestion</b>		1.890	5.2%	0.321
I suffer from overcrowding and congestion	0.68298			
Residents will not enjoy the case of attracting more tourists to Kusadasi	0.48968			
<b>Negative economic benefits</b>		1.334	4.9%	0.423
Tourism establishments should pay more tax than others	0.46270			
Ordinary residents cannot benefit from the tourism industry	0.46740			
<b>Cultural concerns</b>		1.409	2.9%	0.428
Tourists have positively impacted our culture	0.65407			
Cultural benefits of tourism outweigh negative social impacts	0.77329			
<b>Support for tourism establishments</b>		1.440	1.8%	0.472
It is needed to encourage more tourism establishments to attract more tourists	0.42362			
It is needed to encourage more quality and boutique tourism establishments to attract more tourists	0.84760			

Total variance explained: 85.7%. Reliability alpha: 0.713.

thing). It must be noted that exceeding the stage of annoyance means that residents reach the antagonism stage, which is a serious issue for the future of the tourism industry. In this study it was found that only 5% of the respondents were in the antagonism stage. The remaining were enthusiasm (6.5%) and apathy (7.5%). Related to question 13, question 14 was designed to get general information about respondents' sentiments to their own city. The question was, "What will you do if tourism industry in Kusadasi declines one day?" Over half (55.5%) of

the respondents wanted to do their best actively to cope with negative consequences of tourism; 8% were passive, 4% did not want to extend personal effort, and 32.5% laid the blames on others.

Chi-square analysis was also used to determine statistically significant relationships. In this respect, several independent variables (length of residence, tourism-related occupation, and age) and dependent variables (threshold level of respondents toward tourism development, sentiment to their own city, and perception toward tourism development level of



Kusadasi) were used in examining whether or not relationships existed. The pattern of relationships between independent variables and dependent variables is shown in Table 3.

As shown in Table 3, results of the chi-square analysis indicated that only tourism-related occupation did not differentiate. Statistically significant differences across length of residence—excluding perceptions toward tourism development of Kusadasi—and age were found.

### Conclusions

The results of a study of residents' attitudes toward tourism development in a resort community—Kusadasi—by reviewing past researches within the theoretical framework have been presented. In this study two main findings were explored. The first is that residents were found to be largely reactive toward tourism development because it increased a variety of problems in their own city. Factor solutions show that negative attitudes were mainly related to the development process of the city, which was initially cultural based but then turned toward mass activities, which included congestion, overcrowding, density, energy shortages, and increased prices, particularly in the peak tourism seasons. In addition, 63% of the respondents perceived the level of tourism development of Kusadasi as negative. Connected with this finding, they also were not satisfied with the planning efforts and environmental issues that were performed by formal authorities. Moreover, respondents were in the annoyance stage

of Doxey's Irridex model. As mentioned, exceeding this stage would lead to the stage of antagonism, which is most serious for the future of destination. The second main finding was residents' support toward problems. Residents generally were willing to cope with problems, according to their sentiments about their community. Although they were subjected to various problems related to the tourism industry, residents were aware of the necessity of tourism for their local economy.

The relationships between variables were measured and significant differentiations were found within age and length of residence. Contrary to some earlier studies (Liu et al., 1987; Martin et al., 1998; Milman & Pizam, 1988; Murphy, 1985; Pizam, 1978; Thomason et al., 1979), no significant differentiation in relation to economical dependence on the tourism industry was found. The finding that the longer residents have lived in the destination the more negative attitudes toward tourism occur with time (Brougham & Butler, 1981; Liu et al., 1987; Sheldon & Var, 1984; Um & Crompton, 1987) has been supported by this study.

The implication of this study suggests that local and central administrators should pay more attention to the problems and residents' feelings. They also should try to educate residents about both costs and benefits of tourism. Residents' efforts in the planning process also should not be ignored. Clearly, by having residents play an active role in the planning process, long-term development of the city can be effectively managed through consensus.

Table 3  
The Pattern of Relationships Between Independent Variables and Dependent Variables

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables		
	Length of Residence	Tourism-Related Occupation	Age
Threshold level toward tourism development in Kusadasi	0.01 <sup>a</sup>	N/S	0.001 <sup>c</sup>
Sentiment to Kusadasi	0.01 <sup>b</sup>	N/S	0.001 <sup>d</sup>
Perceptions toward tourism development level of Kusadasi	N/S	N/S	0.001 <sup>e</sup>

<sup>a</sup> $\chi^2(24) = 45.480, p < 0.01$ .

<sup>b</sup> $\chi^2(24) = 46.795, p < 0.01$ .

<sup>c</sup> $\chi^2(12) = 88.868, p < 0.001$ .

<sup>d</sup> $\chi^2(12) = 64.011, p < 0.001$ .

<sup>e</sup> $\chi^2(16) = 94.006, p < 0.001$ .



Future research should enlarge the sample size to obtain more data from a host population. Longitudinal research is also recommended. In addition, even though it is very difficult to determine social carrying capacity of resort communities, researchers should focus on this subject to understand the current level of the community involved. These will be very useful findings for planners and local administrators to help create more-reliable developed destinations and to minimize problems.

#### References

- Akis, S., Peristianis, N., & Warner, J. (1996). Residents' attitudes to tourism development: The case of Cyprus. *Tourism Management*, 17, 481-494.
- Allen, L., Hafer, R. H. R., Long, P. T., & Perdue, R. R. (1993). Rural residents' attitudes toward recreation and tourism development. *Journal of Travel Research*, 31(4), 27-33.
- Allen, L. R., Long, P. T., Perdue, R. R., & Kieselbach, S. (1988). The impact of tourism development on resident's perception of community life. *Journal of Travel Research*, 27(1), 16-21.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19, 665-690.
- Ap, J., & Crompton, L. (1998). Developing and testing a tourism impact scale. *Journal of Travel Research*, 37(2), 121-130.
- Brougham, J. E., & Butler, R. W. (1981). A segmentation analysis of resident attitudes to the social impact of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, VIII(4), 569-590.
- Brown, G., & Giles, R. (1994). Coping with tourism: An examination of resident responses to the social impact of tourism. In A. V. Seaton, C. L. Jenkins, R. C. Wood, P. U. L. Dicke, M. M. Bennett, L. R. MacLellan, & R. Smith (Eds.), *Tourism: The state of the art* (pp. 755-764). Sussex: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- Butler, R. W. (1980). The concept of the tourist area life cycle of evolution: Implications for management of resources. *Canadian Geographer*, 24, 5-12.
- Butler, R. W. (1996). The concept of carrying capacity for tourism destinations: Dead or merely buried? *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 2, 283-293.
- Cohen, E. (1978). The impact of tourism on the physical environment. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 5(2), 215-237.
- Coltman, M. M. (1989). *Introduction to travel and tourism: An international approach*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Dogan, H. Z. (1989). Forms of adjustment socio-cultural impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16, 216-236.
- Doxey, G. V. (1975). A causation theory of visitor-resident irritants; methodology and research inferences. In *Travel and Tourism Research Association Sixth Annual Conference Proceedings* (pp. 195-198). San Diego, CA.
- Gee, C. Y., Choy, D. J. L., & Makens, J. C. (1984). *The travel industry*. Westport, CT: The AVI Publishing Company.
- Getz, D. (1994). Residents' attitudes towards tourism a longitudinal study in Sprey Valley, Scotland. *Tourism Management*, 15(4), 247-258.
- Holloway, J. C. (1989). *The business of tourism* (3rd ed.). London: Pitman Publishing.
- Hudman, L. E., & Hawkins, D. E. (1989). *Tourism in contemporary society: An introductory text*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Husband, W. (1989). Social status and perception of tourism in Zambia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 16, 237-253.
- Johnson, J. D., Snepenger, D. J., & Akis, S. (1994). Residents' perceptions of tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(3), 629-642.
- Jurowski, C. (1998). A study of community sentiments in relation to attitudes toward tourism development. *Tourism Analysis*, 3, 17-24.
- Jurowski, C., Uysal, M., & Williams, D. R. (1997). A theoretical analysis of host community resident reactions to tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 36(2), 3-11.
- King, B., Pizam, A., & Milman, D. R. (1993). Social impacts of tourism: Host perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20, 660-665.
- Lankford, S. V., & Howard, D. R. (1994). Developing a tourism impact attitude scale. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21, 121-139.
- Lindberg, K., Dellaert, B. G. C., & Rassing, C. R. (1999). Resident tradeoffs: A choice modeling approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(3), 554-569.
- Lindberg, K., & Johnson, R. L. (1997). Modeling resident attitudes toward tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(2), 402-424.
- Liu, J. C., Sheldon, P. J., & Var, T. (1987). Resident perceptions of the environmental impacts of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 14, 17-37.
- Liu, J. C., & Var, T. (1986). Resident attitudes toward tourism impacts in Hawaii. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 13, 193-214.
- Long, P. T., Perdue, R. R., & Allen, L. (1990). Rural resident tourism perceptions and attitudes by community level of tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 28(3), 39.
- Madrigal, R. (1993). A tale of tourism in two cities. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20, 336-353.
- Martin, B. S. (1999). The efficacy of growth machine theory in explaining resident perceptions of community tourism development. *Tourism Analysis*, 4(1), 47-55.
- Martin, B., McGuire, F., & Allen, L. (1998). Retirees' attitudes toward tourism: Implications for sustainable development. *Tourism Analysis*, 1, 43-51.
- Martin, B. S., & Uysal, M. (1990). An examination of the relationship between carrying capacity and the tourism lifecycle: Management and policy implications. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 31, 327-333.
- Mathieson, A., & Wall, G. (1982). *Tourism: Economic, physical and social impacts*. London: Longman.
- McIntosh, R. W., & Goeldner, C. R. (1986). *Tourism: Principles, practices, philosophies* (4th ed.). New York: Wiley.



- Mill, R., & Morrison, A. M. (1985). *The tourism system: An introductory text*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Milman, A., & Pizam, A. (1988). Social impacts of tourism on Central Florida. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 15, 191-204.
- Murphy, P. E. (1985). *Tourism: A community approach*. New York: Methuen.
- Nemety, A. (1990). Resorts go up . . . and down. *Snow Country*, 3(7), 31-32.
- Pearce, D. (1989). *Tourism development* (2nd ed.). London: Longman Scientific.
- Perdue, R. R., Long, P. T., & Allen, L. (1990). Resident support for tourism development. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17, 586-599.
- Pizam, A. (1978). Tourism's impacts: The social costs to the destination community as perceived by its residents. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(4), 8-12.
- Pizam, A., Milman, A., & King, B. (1994). The perceptions of tourism employees and their families towards tourism: A cross-cultural comparison. *Tourism Management*, 15(1), 53-61.
- Pizam, A., & Pokela, J. (1978). Businessman and residents' perceptions of tourism's impacts: Analysis and implications for tourism policy making. In *International Tourism Congress: New Perspectives and Policies* (pp. 233-250). Ankara, Turkey: Mugla School of Business Administration.
- Rothman, R. (1978). Residents and transients: Community reaction to seasonal visitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 16(3), 8-13.
- Ryan, C., & Montgomery, D. (1994). The attitudes of Bakewell residents to tourism and issues in community responsive tourism. *Tourism Management*, 15(5), 358-369.
- Sheldon, P., & Var, T. (1984). Resident attitudes to tourism in North Wales. *Tourism Management*, 5(1), 40-47.
- Snaith, T., & Haley, A. (1999). Residents' opinions of tourism development in the historic city of York, England. *Tourism Management*, 20, 595-603.
- Soutar, G. N., & McLeod, P. B. (1993). Residents' perceptions on impact of the America's cup. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 20, 571-582.
- Thomason, P., Crompton, J. L., & Kamp, D. B. (1979). A study of the attitudes of impacted groups within a host community toward prolonged stay tourist visitors. *Journal of Travel Research*, 17(3), 2-6.
- Turco, D. M. (1998). Host residents' perceived social costs and benefits toward a staged tourist attraction. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 7(1), 21-30.
- Um, S., & Crompton, J. L. (1987). Measuring resident's attachment levels in a host community. *Journal of Travel Research*, 25(3), 27-29.
- Urry, J. (1990). *The tourist gaze: Leisure and travel in contemporary societies*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Young, T., Thyne, M., & Lawson, R. (1999). Comparative study of tourism perceptions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(12), 442-445.